pinimum wages rates applicable to rsers in vaiious occupations are implemented lully, in letter and spi-. and

(bi whether Government are grant-,,,. notified minimum uayis 10 wj,..-it engaged in developmental pro-,mes?

THE MINISTER OF STAiF. 01? THE MiNbTRV OF LAB^.tJiC [bHRI M. I'. VEERENDRA KUM ,Ki: (aj Ihe en-forcement machiuery set up for en-(oicing provisions of the Minimum Wages Act. I94S is expected to conduct inspection and uuen action against defaulting employei whenever any violation to the Act is delected.

(b) Under the rural developmental programmes like Javvahar Rojgai Vojana. wages are to be paid as per minimum iates of wages as notified by die concerned State Governments! L'nion Territory Admin stiat ons for the relevant scheduled employment. The Central Government on its part have infoimed ihe Siaie Governments ory Administrations that 'i »ill withhold ihe grants to the Slatess'Union Teniories in case the implementing agencies do not ray 'the minimum notified wages to the I potters emploml in ihe ruial deve-development programme.

AjMda in the Labour Ministers' conference

' SHRI RAIUBHA1 V PARMAR; the Minister of LABOUR be whether a Conference of Lah-™ Minister was held in New Delhi july. this scat;

1! [M]- what were the main items

(c) what designes were taken there.

H_h question of providing atone

Child labour prohibitions and related labour (Prohibition .md Re-gulation) Act, 1986 and enacting a Centiai taw on tarm worker*; and

tuj Government's reaction thereto?

iH- MINISTER OF SlATc OF THE MINISTER. Ur LAjivJuK kotttti IU. VccKci>UKA K.(jMrtJRj; iaj and tb; v coineience ot sia..e i-aoour Minis-teis "as neld on /-Sui July, 1*;»7 to review mc progress in the implementation ui tne unecuves of the sup-reme Court on child labour and to uiscuss luc issue of suitable legislative iianicwoik to address the problem ol child laoour, the provisions of the Central Legislation on Agri-cultural Workers and dual control on ihe administration of mecUcal care in ESI Corporation.

tcj and td) In the conference certain suggestions were made to make i IUIU Laboui (.Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986, more effeciive. incse suggestions, inter alia, included that the burden of proof in regard to age and employment of child should OL' on the employer, the oft ON should be made a cognizable one and the penalties should be more sliin-;ent and deterrent. These suggestions would be duly taken into account while finalising ihe amendment proposals

In regard to the pioposcd central ation on agricultural srorksw, representatives "f Mate COM., e*J sed difle.ent views. While the State of West Bengal. Uttar Pradesh ramil Nadu. Pondicherif, Tripuia. Keral.i, Rajasthan. Nagaland, Me«h* laya, Oiissa. lammu A Kashmir, Goa Assam Andhera Pradesh. Arunsdbal Andaman Nfcoittl Wands, National Capital terrority of Delhi ,m Territory of Chandigarh Reported (he proposed Legislative the Suite Govt, at punjab hryana Himachal Pradesh. K«maUfU, ᵛ' ,., and Gujarat had certain servation ,1 umfntfrnr pre>a'lin* in thev States